

Appl. No. : 09/852,963
Filed : May 8, 2001

REMARKS

Applicant herein submits this supplemental amendment and response to the Office Action mailed January 6, 2005 in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed July 22, 2005. Applicant has added Claims 7-13 to the listing of claims. Claims 7-13 have been withdrawn as drawn to non-elected inventions. The amendments to Claims 1-6 and the remarks that follow in this section are otherwise identical to the previously-filed Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed January 6, 2005.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 7-13 have been withdrawn as drawn to non-elected subject matter. The Examiner objected to Claim 1 because it had a typo. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by United States Patent No. 5,590,038 to Pitroda. The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 4 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the Pitroda patent and United States Patent No. 6,615,190 to Slater. Applicant herein amends Claims 1-6.

Objection To Claim 1

Applicant has fixed the typo that the Examiner identified.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant has amended Claims 1-6 and believes that such claims are definite, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pitroda. Pitroda teaches a universal electronic transaction card that stores information about multiple credit card accounts. The card includes a display that displays a "visibly perceptible replica of a credit card and a visibly perceptible replica of the user's signature." The card, which can be used for payment, transmits credit card account data to a point-of-sale device. Additionally, the card can receive data, such as electronic receipts, from the point-of-sale device.

By contrast, the claimed method of Claim 1 allows for the creation of a composed information agent (a software object having state and having one or more possible external connections) by allowing a second information agent to be composed into a first information

Appl. No. : **09/852,963**
Filed : **May 8, 2001**

agent. Such composition of the second information agent into the first information agent is accomplished by defining a functional connection of the second information agent to the first information agent.

Pitroda does not teach composition of a second information agent into a first information agent by defining a functional connection. Indeed, the portions of the Pitroda patent cited by the Examiner, Col. 5, line 14 to Col. 6, line 43, teach the transmission of data from a universal electronic transmission card (a hardware device) to other hardware devices such as a "central health care information processing system." This mere transmission of data from one hardware device to another may be a "connection" in some sense, but it is not a "functional connection" that composes "said second information agent into said first information agent."

Accordingly, because Pitroda does not teach every limitation of Claim 1 as amended, the Examiner cannot properly rely on Pitroda to support an anticipation rejection. Applicant accordingly requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With respect to Claims 2, 5, and 6, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over Pitroda at least for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Additionally, Applicant submits that Claims 2, 5, and 6 are allowable over Pitroda because Pitroda does not teach, respectively, "The method according to claim 1, wherein said first information agent takes said second information agent with said first information agent when said first information agent is relocated to a new environment," "The method according to claim 1 wherein said first application is a desktop provided by an operating system and wherein said second application, in which said second information agent is presented, is different from said first application, but said second information agent can be connected to said first information agent," or "The method according to claim 5 wherein said desktop provided by an operating system is an interface of a platform, said platform selected from the group consisting of: a Windows PC, a Macintosh PC, a unix-type operating system, a set-top box, a wireless logic appliance, an internet appliance, a personal digital assistant, or another device connected to a network." Thus, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Believing that Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are patentable over Pitroda, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Appl. No. : 09/852,963
Filed : May 8, 2001

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 In View of Pitroda and Slater

The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Pitroda and Slater. To support an obviousness rejection, the Examiner must show, in addition to a motivation to combine references, that a combination of references has every limitation of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Pitroda and Slater does not have every limitation of Claims 3 and 4. Specifically, Claims 3 and 4 incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. Applicant has shown that Pitroda does not teach a composition of "said second information agent into said first information agent." Moreover, the Examiner does not assert that Slater teaches this limitations, and Applicant has found no such teaching in Slater. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Pitroda and Slater does not render Claims 3 and 4 obvious because such a combination does not have every limitation of Claims 3 and 4.

Believing that Claims 3 and 4 are patentable over Pitroda and Slater, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of Claims 3 and 4.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: August 11, 2005

By: Ted M. Cannon
Ted M. Cannon
Registration No. 55,036
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404